

comprising one or more correspondence symbols is used as a data entry for a compressed pronunciation dictionary (specification, page 17, lines 13-17). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 34 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

For consistency, allowed claim 43 is also amended to recite "wherein at least one said correspondence symbol *forms a symbol set for use as a compressed entry in generating said compressed pronunciation dictionary.*"

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 5, the Examiner rejected claims 34-39 and 50-54 as being unpatentable over Heising (5,333,313) in view of Komissarchik (5,799,276). The Examiner argued that Heising teaches the claimed invention, but does "not explicitly teach a correspondence symbol for use as a compressed data entry in generating said compressed pronunciation dictionary " (paper no. 5). However, the Examiner stated that Komissarchik does teach a compressed phonetic dictionary, and that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this compressed phonetic dictionary in the device of Heising using a symbol to identify the entry. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As amended, one or more correspondence symbols form a symbol set, which is used as a compressed data entry in generating a compressed pronunciation dictionary. Thus, a symbol set "43 161 89 and 123" is the compressed data entry

representation of the dictionary word "enough" and the corresponding dictionary phonemes are "IH n UX f" (specification, page 17, lines 13-17).

In contrast, Komissarchik does not disclose such a use for correspondence symbols or symbol sets. Instead, Komissarchik discloses an apparatus and method which "employs a largely speaker-independent dictionary based upon the application of phonological and phonetic/acoustic rules to generate acoustic event transcriptions against which the series of hypothesized acoustic feature vectors are compared to select word choices" (abstract). There is no teaching or suggestion that these phonologic and phonetic/acoustic rule sets are represented by any symbols, nor are the rule sets used to form symbol sets for compressed data entry in a decompressed pronunciation dictionary. The Komissarchik invention is directed towards a speech recognition system and does not teach or suggest any form of symbol use for compression purposes.

Additionally, the text entry of the present invention is distinguished from Heising. While text entry of a word in the present invention may be a portion of the dictionary word (i.e., there are four text entries for "enough": "e", "n", "ou", "gh"), text entry in Heising is the entire word itself (i.e., "enough") (col. 6, line 33 to col. 7, line 36). Therefore, the correspondence text entry of the present invention is patently distinct from the entry word of Heising.

The Examiner argued that the correspondence phoneme entry is also disclosed in Heising. However, the pronunciation of a word is part of "a second part

database from the master database consisting of a multiplicity of placeholders, each placeholder corresponding to ... a pronunciation..." (col. 2, lines 42-53). Thus, the placeholder of Heising represents an entire pronunciation of a word entry.

In contrast, the present invention's correspondence phoneme entry represents a pronunciation of a correspondence text entry. Because the text entry may be only a portion of a dictionary word, the phoneme entry may only represent a partial pronunciation of the dictionary word. For example, the word "enough" has four phoneme entries: "IH", "n", "UX", and "f". Therefore, the phoneme entry of the present invention is distinguished from the placeholder of Heising.

Furthermore, the present invention discloses having a text entry, phoneme entry, and symbol in one correspondence table. These symbols identify the correspondence set and are utilized to form a symbol set used as a compressed data entry in generating a compressed pronunciation dictionary. None of the prior art references teaches or suggests having a text entry, phoneme entry, and symbol in one correspondence table which is utilized to form a symbol set. Nor do any of the references teach or suggest the use of a symbol set as a compressed data entry in generating a compressed pronunciation dictionary.

In view of the above discussion, claims 34 and 50, as amended, are patentably distinguishable from Heising and Komissarchik. Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of independent claims 34 and 50 and their dependent claims 35-39 and 51-55 be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing amendments to the claims and the above remarks, Applicant believes that the rejections in the Office Action of January 19, 2000 are fully overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has questions regarding the case, he is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Fredenburg

Date: 4/19/00

By: *Susan Yee*
Susan Yee, Reg. No. 41,388
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444